



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/537,858	03/28/2000	Paul Proost	49674	5522
21874	7590	01/15/2004	EXAMINER	
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP			ROARK, JESSICA H	
P.O. BOX 9169			ART UNIT	
BOSTON, MA 02209			PAPER NUMBER	
			1644	

DATE MAILED: 01/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/537,858

Applicant(s)

PROOST ET AL.

Examiner

Jessica H. Roark

Art Unit

1644

All Participants:

(1) Jessica H. Roark.

(2) Dianne Rees.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 12 January 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:



Telephonic



Video Conference



Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

24-30

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's comments in the Response filed 10/2/03 suggest that the Office had inadvertently examined the wrong claim set in the Office Action of 3/31/03. Applicant provided the text of claim 24 as Applicant believed the claim was filed in the Amendment of 1/21/03. The text of the claim 24 presented in the Remarks filed 10/2/03 does not correspond to the text of any claim pending before the Examiner. It is noted that the Claim set received 1/21/03 appears to have been a duplicate submission of the claims filed in the proposed after final amendment received 7/25/02.

To address this discrepancy, the Examiner requested that Applicant submit a new set of claims.

Applicant agreed.